



**HAL**  
open science

# Defining Functionally Relevant Spatial Chromatin Domains: It is a TAD Complicated

Natalia Sikorska, Tom Sexton

## ► To cite this version:

Natalia Sikorska, Tom Sexton. Defining Functionally Relevant Spatial Chromatin Domains: It is a TAD Complicated. *Journal of Molecular Biology*, 2020, 432, pp.653 - 664. <10.1016/j.jmb.2019.12.006>. <hal-03489556>

**HAL Id: hal-03489556**

**<https://hal.science/hal-03489556v1>**

Submitted on 7 Mar 2022

HAL is a multi-disciplinary open access archive for the deposit and dissemination of scientific research documents, whether they are published or not. The documents may come from teaching and research institutions in France or abroad, or from public or private research centers.

L'archive ouverte pluridisciplinaire HAL, est destinée au dépôt et à la diffusion de documents scientifiques de niveau recherche, publiés ou non, émanant des établissements d'enseignement et de recherche français ou étrangers, des laboratoires publics ou privés.



Distributed under a Creative Commons CC BY-NC 4.0 - Attribution - Non-commercial use - International License

# **Defining functionally relevant spatial chromatin domains: it's a TAD complicated**

Natalia Sikorska<sup>1-4</sup> and Tom Sexton<sup>1-4</sup>

<sup>1</sup> Institute of Genetics and Molecular and Cellular Biology (IGBMC), 1 rue Laurent Fries,  
67404 Illkirch, France

<sup>2</sup> CNRS UMR7104, 1 rue Laurent Fries, 67404 Illkirch, France

<sup>3</sup> INSERM U1258, 1 rue Laurent Fries, 67404 Illkirch, France

<sup>4</sup> University of Strasbourg, 1 rue Laurent Fries, 67404, Illkirch, France

Correspondence to Tom Sexton: IGBMC, 1 rue Laurent Fries, 67404 Illkirch, France.

sexton@igbmc.fr +33 (0)3 88 65 35 80

## **Abstract**

Chromosome conformation capture and orthologous methods uncovered the spatial organization of metazoan chromosomes into autonomously folded substructures, often termed topologically associated domains (TADs). There is a striking correlation between TAD organization and hallmarks of genome function, such as histone modifications or gene expression, and disruptions of specific TAD structures have been associated with pathological misexpression of underlying genes. However, complete disruption of TADs seems to have mild effects on the transcriptome, raising questions as to the importance of chromatin topology in regulating the expression of most genes. Furthermore, despite a growing number of genetic perturbation studies, it is still largely unclear how TAD-like domains are defined, maintained or potentially reorganized. This Perspectives article discusses the recent work exploring the complexity of the relationship between TADs and transcription, arguing that it is not satisfactorily explained by any ‘rules’ which have been previously described.

## **Keywords**

Topologically associated domain (TAD); Hi-C; CTCF; loop extrusion; boundaries

## *A brief history of TADs*

Since descriptions of heterochromatin from microscopy studies in the early 20<sup>th</sup> century, it has been appreciated that the genome is a heterogeneous and organized structure, long proposed to contribute to regulation of its functions such as transcription, replication and repair. The advent of chromosome conformation capture methods, coupled to high-throughput sequencing (Hi-C), has expanded the coverage and resolution of complementary microscopy studies, uncovering an apparent hierarchical folding regime of the genome<sup>1</sup> (**Fig 1**). In particular, some of the first Hi-C (and other variant) studies uncovered the organization of metazoan chromosomes into discrete, sub-megabase domains, often termed TADs (topologically associated domains), whereby intra-domain interactions are stronger than those spanning the borders between TADs<sup>2-4</sup>. TAD organization closely mirrors the functional demarcation of chromatin regions according to transcriptional activity<sup>2; 4; 5</sup>, histone modifications<sup>2-4; 6</sup> and replication timing<sup>7</sup>, implying that genome structure and function may be mechanistically coupled. However, TAD organization was unchanged in mutant cell lines disrupting deposition of specific histone modifications<sup>3</sup>. Further, despite extensive transcriptomic and epigenomic differences between cell types<sup>8</sup>, initial Hi-C studies found that TAD organization was largely invariant<sup>9</sup>, even when comparing syntenic regions across different species<sup>10</sup>. TADs thus appearing to be ‘hard-wired’, research efforts have since mostly focused on the fundamental mechanisms by which they are formed, and if or how such organization impinges on genome function.

## *TADs: an equilibrium of loop formation, growth and dissociation?*

Analysis of TAD boundaries revealed a high enrichment for active genes across metazoans<sup>2; 4; 11; 12</sup>, and co-binding of the insulator protein CTCF and the cohesin complex in mammalian

cells<sup>2; 13</sup>. Whereas cohesin is not enriched at *Drosophila* TAD borders, many fly-specific insulator proteins are present in addition to CTCF<sup>4; 12; 14</sup>. CTCF<sup>15</sup> (and other insulators in *Drosophila*<sup>16; 17</sup>) and cohesin<sup>18; 19</sup> are implicated in the formation of chromatin loops via pairing of bound loci. It was proposed that stable anchoring of paired boundaries in this manner could organize the intervening chromatin into a TAD. Indeed, higher-resolution Hi-C maps in human cells found that a significant fraction of domains were demarcated by interaction foci at the ‘corners’, implying an anchoring loop<sup>6</sup> (see also **Fig 1**). Such loops are strongly enriched in CTCF and cohesin; even more strikingly, almost exclusively when the CTCF-binding DNA sequence motifs are in a convergent orientation<sup>6; 10</sup>. The importance of the motif orientation was further demonstrated by loss of specific chromatin loops when one of the motifs was experimentally inverted<sup>20-22</sup>. CTCF binding to the inverted site is unaffected, so how can the orientation of a twenty-nucleotide sequence have such a drastic effect on an interaction that can span a megabase, where there should be no torsional constraints on a simple protein-protein pairing event? An explanation can be provided by the loop extrusion model<sup>22; 23</sup>, whereby chromatin loops are constantly being extruded at many positions along the genome with a certain processivity before disassembling. The encounter (and presumed direct interaction) of two convergent CTCF complexes somehow forms a roadblock for further extrusion of any loops, resulting in an equilibrium of TADs demarcated by a seemingly stabilized loop interaction between the boundaries (**Fig 2**). Cohesin has been proposed as the loop extruding factor based on different lines of evidence. First, acute degradation of cohesin protein or deletion of its loading factor, *Nipbl*, completely removes TADs<sup>24-26</sup>. More precisely, cohesin mutants deficient in ATP hydrolysis have a greatly reduced TAD organization<sup>27</sup>, suggesting that cohesin-mediated loop extrusion is an active process. Second, perturbations of factors that unload cohesin from chromatin enhance longer-range CTCF-CTCF loop and TAD formation<sup>26; 28</sup>, presumably as more processive loops can

now extend beyond their usual boundaries. Third, while yet to be demonstrated for cohesins, ATP-dependent DNA loop extrusion by the closely related condensin complex was directly visualized *in vivo*<sup>29</sup>. Loop extrusion has been incorporated into different polymer physics models of chromosome folding, and is currently the only model that predicts a requirement for convergent CTCF sites<sup>22; 23; 30; 31</sup>. However, it should be noted that many features of Hi-C contact maps can be fitted by alternative physical models<sup>32; 33</sup>.

Taken together, a simplistic view of TADs has been built up whereby a pair of bound convergent CTCF sites can predict much of a chromosome's topology via cohesin-mediated loop extrusion. However, this model breaks down on many occasions. First, not all TAD borders contain CTCF<sup>2; 11</sup>, in line with the disruption of many, but not all, TADs on acute CTCF degradation<sup>34</sup> (see also **Fig 3**). Conversely, the majority of CTCF-bound sites do not appear to form TAD borders, suggesting that other, unknown principles determine whether chromatin looping and/or domain organization is mediated by CTCF pairs. As noted examples, inversion of specific CTCF sites does indeed disrupt chromatin loops<sup>20-22</sup>; however, *de novo* loop formation between the inverted site and a now convergent CTCF-bound site in the opposite direction to the 'wild-type' interaction is almost never observed. Similarly, interactions were detected for less than half of the 'potential' convergent CTCF-bound motif pairs in one of the highest-resolution human Hi-C datasets to date<sup>6</sup> (and possibly, much fewer; see **Note**). Thus extra, unknown principles appear to need to be added to the 'convergent rule' for predicting CTCF-mediated loop formation, let alone their possible role in organizing TADs.

***Looking beyond CTCF... and beyond loop extrusion?***

The other major class of TAD boundaries, often independent of CTCF binding, is active genes<sup>2; 4; 11; 12</sup>. Although the loading and tracking of RNA polymerase during transcription causes topological changes on the underlying DNA<sup>35</sup>, the link to TAD organization is much less clear. Bound transcriptional machinery may conceivably block cohesin loop extrusion, and cohesin is indeed enriched at CTCF-negative TAD borders containing active genes<sup>11</sup>. Further, in the absence of CTCF, cohesin is predominantly found at active promoters<sup>36</sup>, although it is unclear whether this represents stalled loop extrusion points or the initial cohesin loading sites themselves. A direct link between transcription and loop extrusion has yet to be demonstrated. Interestingly, the relatively small subset of TAD borders which are altered during cell differentiation correspond with developmental gene expression changes, whereby borders are stronger at induced genes<sup>11</sup>. Similarly, progressive collinear activation of *Hox* gene clusters are associated with one repressive TAD-like domain splitting to a growing, active domain and a shrinking, repressive domain, with the border tracking to the transition point between active and silent genes<sup>37; 38</sup>. An even more striking correlation between transcription and ‘contact insulation’ (i.e. TAD border strength) is observed in early embryogenesis. Both mammalian and *Drosophila* zygotic chromosomes have no or very weak TADs, which are progressively strengthened throughout embryogenesis, particularly when the genome is activated and zygotic transcription starts<sup>39-41</sup>. It is important to note, however, the mounting evidence pointing against a simple causal link between transcription and TAD organization. First, when comparing developmental stages, the numbers of differentially expressed genes is far greater than then numbers of altered TAD borders. Second, pre-zygotic transcription embryos have very weak TADs in the same positions as later stages, suggesting that their borders are defined independently of ongoing transcription. Third, TAD organization in transcriptionally shut-down spermatocytes is essentially the same as in somatic cells<sup>41</sup>. Fourth, transcription elongation inhibition with drugs only has mild

effects on TAD organization of early embryos<sup>39-41</sup> or apparent cohesin loop extrusion<sup>27</sup>. And finally, ectopic induction of a gene in embryonic stem cells, which forms a TAD border concomitant with gene expression during neural differentiation, had no effect on local TAD organization<sup>11</sup>. Therefore the link between transcription and TADs appears to be indirect and complex.

The very first Hi-C maps had insufficient sequence coverage to characterize TADs, but identified large chromosome regions, termed compartments, with a peculiar organization in that chromatin belonging to a particular compartment type preferentially formed homotypic interactions, and were preferentially localized away from different compartment types (see **Fig 1**)<sup>42</sup>. Although greater numbers of compartment types can be identified from close Hi-C analysis<sup>6; 43</sup>, much of the interaction landscape can be explained by partitioning the genome into two compartments, with one predominantly containing transcriptionally active chromatin, and the other containing gene deserts and repressed genes. Developmental transitions are accompanied by large-scale changes in compartment identity, intimately linked to underlying gene expression<sup>9</sup>. Until recently, the link (if any) between compartments and TADs was unclear. *Drosophila* TADs appear to form homotypic contacts at the level of entire TADs, consistent with a higher-order organization defined by compartment identity<sup>4</sup>. Such a hierarchy is less evident within mammalian Hi-C maps, but has been reported on closer analysis<sup>44</sup>. However, TADs and compartments were subsequently found to be mechanistically decoupled (see also **Fig 3**); CTCF abrogation weakened most TADs but left compartment organization intact<sup>34</sup>. More strikingly, experiments disrupting (perturbing cohesin or cohesin-loading factors)<sup>24-26</sup> or enhancing (perturbing factors unloading cohesin)<sup>28</sup> loop extrusion caused, respectively, bolstering or dampening of compartments, suggesting that the mechanism organizing compartmentalization may actually compete with cohesin/CTCF-mediated TAD organization. Ultra-high resolution Hi-C studies of *Drosophila*,

and eukaryotic species lacking CTCF, found that seemingly coarse compartments can actually be resolved to very small ‘compartmental domains’, entirely explained by alternating runs of gene activity and inactivity<sup>45</sup>. This fine-scale organization is less apparent in large mammalian genomes, but was also observed. Very recently, a Hi-C variant able to give pairwise interaction maps at nucleosome resolution (‘MicroC’), was reported to uncover ‘micro-TADs’ at the level of single gene units<sup>46</sup>. Overall, these findings suggest that very local chromatin state, particularly transcriptional activity, can influence local domain structures, perhaps autonomously. Unclear mechanisms, which may involve self-organizing principles (for example, genomic loci sharing bound factors which co-associate are more likely to be stabilized by the exchange of factors between them<sup>1; 47</sup>) and/or phase separation causing aggregation of RNA polymerase-bound loci<sup>48</sup>, can then promote homotypic interactions between active or inactive small domains in the formation of compartments. Somehow, this ‘ground state’ of the folded chromosome may have an extra organization imposed upon it in mammalian cells by loop extrusion principles, with the boundaries of these TADs largely (but not completely) defined by CTCF. Although these principles can be recapitulated in physical models<sup>31</sup>, more work needs to be done to explore their generality. For example, it is unclear whether transcriptionally active regions additionally act as TAD borders by acting as roadblocks for cohesin-mediated loops, whether additional promoter-enhancer looping interactions disrupt or reinforce other spatial organization principles, and/or whether the TAD ‘border’ of an active gene is actually a very small active compartment, disrupting the organization of flanking repressive compartments.

***TADs as genuine but extremely heterogeneous physical domains***

Conventional Hi-C reports the average interaction map of millions of fixed nuclei, raising the question as to whether TADs are the genuine physically folded domains proposed from initial studies, or are instead just a statistical phenomenon. More recent adaptations of the Hi-C method to single cells revealed a large heterogeneity in chromosome structure and nuclear organization<sup>49-51</sup>. Interestingly, although their exact fitted structures can be highly variable, TADs were consistently identified in nearly all non-mitotic cells. Complementary high-throughput and/or super-resolution microscopy studies, labeling DNA sequences in individual fixed cells by *in situ* hybridization, showed a similar prevalence of TAD structures with a very large heterogeneity<sup>52-54</sup>. Closer analysis of numerous pairwise interactions further showed that TADs appear to be made up of a plethora of low-frequency interactions, with no one specific looping interaction appearing to define a TAD in every cell<sup>55; 56</sup>. Interestingly, TAD-like domains were observed in individual cells by microscopy studies after cohesin depletion, but were no longer delimited by CTCF/cohesin sites<sup>52</sup>. Since the domain borders were highly variable from cell to cell on cohesin depletion, population-averaged Hi-C approaches could not detect these structures. Thus chromosomes appear to form genuine physically folded domains, in many but not all cases corresponding well to TADs called by Hi-C methods, but with a large degree of cell-to-cell variability. Two related open questions are whether different domain structures observed within cell populations correlate with transcriptional status, and how dynamic domain structures can be within the cell cycle of a particular cell. Cutting-edge microscopic techniques can now incorporate the high-coverage *in situ* hybridization of DNA and nascent RNA molecules<sup>57; 58</sup>. Initial studies show a slight correlation between chromatin substructure and transcription of underlying genes, although chromatin structure is not necessarily a good predictor of gene activity. Addressing the second question requires extension of live chromatin imaging techniques to entire domains, an ambitious but exciting prospect.

### *Are TADs functionally important?*

Due to their link to insulator proteins, TADs have been proposed to delimit functionally ‘autonomous’ parts of the genome, in particular by restricting the operational range of distal regulatory elements such as enhancers<sup>1</sup>. Well characterized enhancers were frequently found in the same TAD as their target gene. More formally, enhancer trap assays found that reporters falling within the same TAD had largely the same expression patterns<sup>59</sup>, and genome-wide analysis of promoter-enhancer chromatin loops found a strong predominance of intra-TAD contacts<sup>60</sup>. In addition to preventing aberrant interactions between promoters and inappropriate regulatory elements, TAD organization may also make cognate promoter-enhancer interactions more efficient by reducing the search space of the two loci<sup>61</sup>. However, the aforementioned perturbation studies that removed TADs had only mild effects on the transcriptome<sup>24; 25; 34</sup>, suggesting that domain insulation is largely not required for appropriate gene expression regulation. Recent elegant genome engineering studies within key developmental loci have found that altered TAD structures can indeed deregulate expression of genes under complex control from multiple regulatory elements. However the results from just this handful of model loci suggest the phenotypic consequences of altered TADs are context-dependent, and difficult to predict from any ‘rules’ (see **Table 1** for overview). In the X-inactivation locus and the *Wnt6/Ihh/Epha4/Pax3* region associated with many genetic diseases affecting limb formation, quite large deletion events (58 kb to > 1 Mb) at a TAD border cause fusion of the flanking TADs and ectopic expression of certain genes due to increased contacts with aberrant enhancers<sup>3; 62</sup>. In some cases, this gene deregulation is sufficient for the underlying genetic disease. Interestingly, slightly smaller deletions omitting the CTCF sites presumed to define the TAD border did not cause TAD fusion or ectopic transcription<sup>62</sup>. Similarly, somatic copy number alterations in cancers have also been found to

disrupt TADs and create ectopic promoter-enhancer interactions<sup>63</sup>. At other loci, such as *Hoxd* or the *Kcnj2/Sox9* region linked to sex determination, TAD structures were resilient to even quite large ‘border’ deletions<sup>64; 65</sup>. In the case of *Kcnj2/Sox9*, TAD fusion could only be achieved by making compound deletions of the CTCF sites at the border and of multiple intra-TAD CTCF sites<sup>64</sup>. The dependence of TAD structures on architectures within the domains has been previously described<sup>33</sup>, but has been largely overlooked by current models of loop extrusion which only require a barrier at the borders. Even more interestingly, the TAD fusion at *Kcnj2/Sox9* had no transcriptomic or pathological consequences, although inversions or duplications at the same border produced very strong sex determination and/or limb development phenotypes<sup>64; 66</sup>. Thus in this locus, TAD organization is not required for an enhancer to efficiently find its cognate gene, nor do ectopic enhancer-promoter contacts necessarily lead to aberrant transcription. Instead, *Sox9* expression is reduced by inappropriate dosage of *cis*-regulatory elements (in duplications, assuming the whole regulatory environment remains in the same TAD<sup>66</sup>) or by being isolated from its enhancers (in inversions)<sup>64</sup>. Similar to the latter case, inversions within the X-inactivation locus can swap the *cis*-regulatory environment of the competing genes *Xist* and *Tsix*, leading to ectopic activation of the former in male cells<sup>67</sup>. Larger inversions, which move local regulatory elements along with the gene, have milder phenotypes. These case study experiments greatly enrich and refine the conclusions drawn from genome-wide studies on global abrogation of *trans*-acting factors, and are necessary to move from simplistic models to a fuller understanding of any links between chromatin architecture and transcriptional control.

### ***A question of scale?***

Conversely to some of the phenotypic resilience described above, deletions of just one or two CTCF sites within the *Hoxa* locus alters the chromatin boundaries delimiting repressive histone modifications during neural development, and can generate homeotic transformations<sup>68: 69</sup>. Although these sites clearly define functional domains, they are not identified as TAD borders in extremely high-resolution Hi-C maps in embryonic stem cells, neural precursors or neurons<sup>11</sup> (see **Fig 4**). Altered contact profiles with the *Hoxa5* gene are observed by 4C (a 3C variant identifying all interactions with one bait of interest) when these CTCF sites are deleted in embryonic stem cells (**Fig 4**), and become even more pronounced during neural differentiation<sup>68: 69</sup>, suggesting that potentially important functional architectures are also present at a level below discernible TADs. Does this mean that there are smaller ‘contact domains’, like the ‘microTADs’ recently reported<sup>46</sup>, which may also be functionally relevant, or are different architectural principles involved? Computational calling of TADs is heavily dependent on both the Hi-C sequencing depth<sup>6</sup> and the assumptions of the algorithms used<sup>70</sup> (*There may also be other articles within this Special Issue to cite here*), particularly as the contact map patterns are often hierarchical and sometimes partially overlapping (**Fig 4**). As sequencing depth of Hi-C experiments has increased, the literature has been filled with vague and confusing terms, such as ‘sub-TADs’ (proposed to be developmentally dynamic sub-parts of stable TADs)<sup>71</sup>, ‘microTADs’<sup>46</sup> and ‘mega-domains’ (very large TAD-like structures found on the inactive X chromosome)<sup>72</sup>, with a potential hierarchical link between them<sup>44</sup>. Closer analysis suggests that what may be considered ‘conventional’ TADs from functional definitions (e.g. CTCF-mediated borders, cell type conservation, tendency to contain co-expressed genes), are not a special structural level of folding; hierarchical lower- and higher-scale domains are indeed present<sup>73</sup>. These findings raise questions. Which biochemical and physical principles define such chromosome folding: is a combination of loop extrusion and homotypic compartmentalization enough? If

hierarchical domains are a ubiquitous feature of chromosome folding, what determines whether they are functional and/or linked to transcriptional control? Despite a large research effort to tackle this question e.g.,<sup>11; 27; 40; 74</sup>, conflicting findings still arise as to whether transcription is controlled by genome topology, or *vice versa*, nor how direct any such links may be.

### ***Conclusions***

In summary, better and deeper Hi-C datasets, coupled with elegant genome engineering studies, have greatly expanded our knowledge on chromatin folding principles, in general, but on TADs in particular. General evidence points to chromosomes as folding into genuine physical domains, which are often defined by convergent CTCF sites, consistent with a loop extrusion model, likely performed by cohesins. TAD organization generally correlates very well with underlying chromatin accessibility, replication timing, epigenetic profiles and transcriptional status, although the mechanistic link between transcription and TAD structure appears complex and possibly indirect.

Despite immense progress in recent years, more questions are raised than answered. Case studies on developmental gene models points to the dangers in making conclusions about the functional consequences of changes in genome topology from simplistic models. An integrative approach of genomics, microscopy, physical modeling and genome engineering promises to give much needed insight into what remains a fascinating and increasingly tractable question.

**Figure 1.** Multiscale chromatin folding. **a)** Schematic of features of chromatin folding at different scales, and **b)** the appearance of the underlying Hi-C contact map that allows deduction of the topological feature. Contact maps have the chromosomal coordinates of the

two interacting regions in the x and y axes, with their corresponding interaction strength denoted by the color of the heatmap. They invariably have a strong diagonal, corresponding to very frequent interactions between regions that are adjacent on the linear chromosome fiber. **i)** Chromosomes (denoted by different colors in **a**) fold into distinct territories, with limited intermingling between chromosomes. In the Hi-C contact map, most signal is restricted to the squares on the matrix corresponding to intrachromosomal interactions. **ii)** Chromosomal regions tend to coalesce into two different compartments (red or blue), whereby chromatin of the same ‘color’ tends to co-associate, with reduced interactions between chromatin regions of opposite ‘color’. This is inferred from the patchwork pattern of the Hi-C contact map, caused by alternating regions of increased and reduced interactions. **iii)** Chromosomes tend to fold into discrete TADs, whereby interactions within a domain are stronger than interactions between domains, represented by squares on the diagonal of Hi-C contact maps. The ‘edges’ of the squares correspond to TAD borders. TADs often have foci of strong interactions between borders (‘spots’ on the corners of the squares; see also **Fig 4**). **iv)** Looping interactions are inferred as foci or ‘spots’ on the contact map, whereby the interaction between two elements is stronger than interactions between flanking regions. In Hi-C maps, the loops at TAD borders are usually the easiest to discern, but others, for example arising from promoter-enhancer interactions, may be observed within TADs.

**Figure 2.** Loop extrusion as a model for TAD formation. Cohesin is continuously loaded and unloaded from interphase chromatin, and bidirectionally extrudes loops while engaged on chromatin. Elements forming a roadblock to extrusion, such as collision of convergent CTCF-bound sites, become a more stable barrier for the extruded TAD.

**Figure 3.** TADs and compartments seem to be competing chromosome topologies. Summary of the effect on compartments or TADs on knockout or acute depletion of different factors involved in cohesin-mediated loop extrusion.

**Figure 4.** Different chromatin structure-function relationships are observed at different scales, suggesting that analyses need to take all scales into account. **a)** High-resolution Hi-C maps from mouse embryonic stem cells<sup>11</sup>, visualized with HiGlass<sup>75</sup>, depict different zoomed in views centered on the *Hoxa* locus. Blue squares indicate the region plotted in the subsequent zoom, going from bottom to top. At larger window sizes (bottom), hierarchical TAD structures are apparent as ‘squares within squares’ on the map diagonal, representing more frequent intra-domain than inter-domain contacts. Foci of stronger Hi-C signal at the ‘corners’ of these squares are CTCF-mediated anchors of the ‘loop domains’ proposed to be formed by loop extrusion<sup>6; 22; 23</sup>. A zoomed in view of the *Hoxa* locus (middle) actually shows the whole gene locus forms its own domain, whose rightmost border (gray dashed line with arrowhead) does not exactly coincide with the conventional CTCF-bound loop domain defining a conventional TAD (black dashed line). Specific CTCF sites whose deletions cause distinct phenotypes<sup>68; 69</sup> are denoted by red and green asterisks (top panel), and are found inside all discernible domains. Gray dashed lines indicate the TAD borders called in the Hi-C study<sup>11</sup>. Cyan squares denote the regions of the map which are zoomed for the next panel. **b)** 4C profiles from the *Hoxa5* bait for wild-type and different CTCF-deletion embryonic stem cells (data from Narendra et al.<sup>69</sup>, processed and visualized as in Ben Zouari et al.<sup>76</sup>), showing sub-domain contact profiles that are not apparent from the Hi-C data which are altered on deletion of CTCF sites.

**Table 1**

<b>Locus</b>	<b>Genetic perturbation</b>	<b>Expression phenotype</b>	<b>Ref</b>
<i>Xist</i>	58 kb border deletion	Yes	3
<i>Xist</i>	40 kb border inversion	Yes	55

<i>Xist</i>	70 kb border (plus <i>Xite</i> ) inversion	Mild	55
<i>Epha4/Pax3/Wnt6</i>	1.67 Mb border deletion	Yes	49
<i>Epha4/Pax3/Wnt6</i>	1.47 Mb near-border deletion	No	49
<i>Epha4/Pax3/Wnt6</i>	~600 kb border deletion	Yes	77
<i>Epha4/Pax3/Wnt6</i>	493 kb near-border deletion	No	49
<i>Epha4/Pax3/Wnt6</i>	1.05 Mb border inversion	Yes	49
<i>Sox9/Kcnj2</i>	400 kb intra-TAD duplication	Yes	54
<i>Sox9/Kcnj2</i>	1.6 Mb inter-TAD duplication	No	54
<i>Sox9/Kcnj2</i>	Deletion of four CTCF sites at border and five intra-TAD CTCF sites	No	51
<i>Sox9/Kcnj2</i>	Inversion of border (four CTCF sites)	Yes	51
<i>Hoxa</i>	Single CTCF deletions	Yes	57

**Table 1.** Non-exhaustive summary of genetic perturbation studies performed at TAD borders around model developmental genes and their consequences on ectopic gene expression.

### Note

Rao et al. report 9448 loop interactions from a ‘1 kb-resolution’ Hi-C map of human lymphoblastoid GM12878 cells<sup>6</sup>. Of these, 3974 (42%) contain a CTCF motif on both anchors of the loop. Of these, 3642 (92%) are in the convergent orientation. A very small number of these span very large distances, larger than known TAD sizes. We have filtered

these loops to those within a megabase distance (3412), but this filtering does not change the conclusions.

ENCODE GM12878 CTCF ChIP-seq data gives 43361 bound peaks<sup>78</sup>. Of these, 28002 contain canonical CTCF motifs, as determined by PWM Tools<sup>79</sup>. The ChIP-seq called peaks containing multiple CTCF motifs were only included in the analysis if all motifs had the same orientation, leaving 27766 unambiguous CTCF-bound regions in a single orientation. Taking the genomic locations and orientations of these regions, we counted 6993 regions on the same chromosome and < 1 Mb apart containing convergent, bound CTCF motifs with no other bound CTCF regions in between. Thus 48% of potential CTCF-CTCF loops, based solely on the requirement of CTCF binding and unambiguous convergent orientation, have reported interactions in the Hi-C map. Since ‘transitive’ CTCF loops, skipping CTCF regions whether in convergent or divergent orientations, were frequently observed<sup>6</sup>, this estimated number of ‘potential’ loops is likely very conservative, and the proportion of actual loops versus potential loops even smaller.

## Acknowledgements

Work in the Sexton lab is supported by funds from the European Research Council (ERC) under the European Union’s Horizon 2020 research and innovation program (Starting Grant 678624 - CHROMTOPOLOGY). NS is a fellow of the Fondation de Recherche Medicale.

## References

1. Sexton, T. & Cavalli, G. (2015). The role of chromosome domains in shaping the functional genome. *Cell* **160**, 1049-59.
2. Dixon, J. R., Selvaraj, S., Yue, F., Kim, A., Li, Y., Shen, Y., Hu, M., Liu, J. S. & Ren, B. (2012). Topological domains in mammalian genomes identified by analysis of chromatin interactions. *Nature* **485**, 376-80.
3. Nora, E. P., Lajoie, B. R., Schulz, E. G., Giorgetti, L., Okamoto, I., Servant, N., Piolot, T., van Berkum, N. L., Meisig, J., Sedat, J., Gribnau, J., Barillot, E., Bluthgen, N., Dekker, J. & Heard, E.

- (2012). Spatial partitioning of the regulatory landscape of the X-inactivation centre. *Nature* **485**, 381-5.
4. Sexton, T., Yaffe, E., Kenigsberg, E., Bantignies, F., Leblanc, B., Hoichman, M., Parrinello, H., Tanay, A. & Cavalli, G. (2012). Three-dimensional folding and functional organization principles of the *Drosophila* genome. *Cell* **148**, 458-72.
  5. Le Dily, F., Bau, D., Pohl, A., Vicent, G. P., Serra, F., Soronellas, D., Castellano, G., Wright, R. H., Ballare, C., Filion, G., Marti-Renom, M. A. & Beato, M. (2014). Distinct structural transitions of chromatin topological domains correlate with coordinated hormone-induced gene regulation. *Genes Dev* **28**, 2151-62.
  6. Rao, S. S., Huntley, M. H., Durand, N. C., Stamenova, E. K., Bochkov, I. D., Robinson, J. T., Sanborn, A. L., Machol, I., Omer, A. D., Lander, E. S. & Aiden, E. L. (2014). A 3D Map of the Human Genome at Kilobase Resolution Reveals Principles of Chromatin Looping. *Cell* **159**, 1665-80.
  7. Pope, B. D., Ryba, T., Dileep, V., Yue, F., Wu, W., Denas, O., Vera, D. L., Wang, Y., Hansen, R. S., Canfield, T. K., Thurman, R. E., Cheng, Y., Gulsoy, G., Dennis, J. H., Snyder, M. P., Stamatoyannopoulos, J. A., Taylor, J., Hardison, R. C., Kahveci, T., Ren, B. & Gilbert, D. M. (2014). Topologically associating domains are stable units of replication-timing regulation. *Nature* **515**, 402-5.
  8. Roadmap Epigenomics, C., Kundaje, A., Meuleman, W., Ernst, J., Bilenky, M., Yen, A., Heravi-Moussavi, A., Kheradpour, P., Zhang, Z., Wang, J., Ziller, M. J., Amin, V., Whitaker, J. W., Schultz, M. D., Ward, L. D., Sarkar, A., Quon, G., Sandstrom, R. S., Eaton, M. L., Wu, Y. C., Pfennig, A. R., Wang, X., Claussnitzer, M., Liu, Y., Coarfa, C., Harris, R. A., Shores, N., Epstein, C. B., Gjoneska, E., Leung, D., Xie, W., Hawkins, R. D., Lister, R., Hong, C., Gascard, P., Mungall, A. J., Moore, R., Chuah, E., Tam, A., Canfield, T. K., Hansen, R. S., Kaul, R., Sabo, P. J., Bansal, M. S., Carles, A., Dixon, J. R., Farh, K. H., Feizi, S., Karlic, R., Kim, A. R., Kulkarni, A., Li, D., Lowdon, R., Elliott, G., Mercer, T. R., Neph, S. J., Onuchic, V., Polak, P., Rajagopal, N., Ray, P., Sallari, R. C., Siebenthal, K. T., Sinnott-Armstrong, N. A., Stevens, M., Thurman, R. E., Wu, J., Zhang, B., Zhou, X., Beaudet, A. E., Boyer, L. A., De Jager, P. L., Farnham, P. J., Fisher, S. J., Haussler, D., Jones, S. J., Li, W., Marra, M. A., McManus, M. T., Sunyaev, S., Thomson, J. A., Tlsty, T. D., Tsai, L. H., Wang, W., Waterland, R. A., Zhang, M. Q., Chadwick, L. H., Bernstein, B. E., Costello, J. F., Ecker, J. R., Hirst, M., Meissner, A., Milosavljevic, A., Ren, B., Stamatoyannopoulos, J. A., Wang, T. & Kellis, M. (2015). Integrative analysis of 111 reference human epigenomes. *Nature* **518**, 317-30.
  9. Dixon, J. R., Jung, I., Selvaraj, S., Shen, Y., Antosiewicz-Bourget, J. E., Lee, A. Y., Ye, Z., Kim, A., Rajagopal, N., Xie, W., Diao, Y., Liang, J., Zhao, H., Lobanenkov, V. V., Ecker, J. R., Thomson, J. A. & Ren, B. (2015). Chromatin architecture reorganization during stem cell differentiation. *Nature* **518**, 331-6.
  10. Vietri Rudan, M., Barrington, C., Henderson, S., Ernst, C., Odom, D. T., Tanay, A. & Hadjur, S. (2015). Comparative Hi-C reveals that CTCF underlies evolution of chromosomal domain architecture. *Cell Rep* **10**, 1297-309.
  11. Bonev, B., Mendelson Cohen, N., Szabo, Q., Fritsch, L., Papadopoulos, G. L., Lubling, Y., Xu, X., Lv, X., Hugnot, J. P., Tanay, A. & Cavalli, G. (2017). Multiscale 3D Genome Rewiring during Mouse Neural Development. *Cell* **171**, 557-572 e24.
  12. Hou, C., Li, L., Qin, Z. S. & Corces, V. G. (2012). Gene density, transcription, and insulators contribute to the partition of the *Drosophila* genome into physical domains. *Mol Cell* **48**, 471-84.
  13. Sofueva, S., Yaffe, E., Chan, W. C., Georgopoulou, D., Vietri Rudan, M., Mira-Bontenbal, H., Pollard, S. M., Schroth, G. P., Tanay, A. & Hadjur, S. (2013). Cohesin-mediated interactions organize chromosomal domain architecture. *EMBO J* **32**, 3119-29.

14. Wang, Q., Sun, Q., Czajkowsky, D. M. & Shao, Z. (2018). Sub-kb Hi-C in *D. melanogaster* reveals conserved characteristics of TADs between insect and mammalian cells. *Nat Commun* **9**, 188.
15. Splinter, E., Heath, H., Kooren, J., Palstra, R. J., Klous, P., Grosveld, F., Galjart, N. & de Laat, W. (2006). CTCF mediates long-range chromatin looping and local histone modification in the beta-globin locus. *Genes Dev* **20**, 2349-54.
16. Blanton, J., Gaszner, M. & Schedl, P. (2003). Protein:protein interactions and the pairing of boundary elements in vivo. *Genes Dev* **17**, 664-75.
17. Comet, I., Schuettengruber, B., Sexton, T. & Cavalli, G. (2011). A chromatin insulator driving three-dimensional Polycomb response element (PRE) contacts and Polycomb association with the chromatin fiber. *Proc Natl Acad Sci U S A* **108**, 2294-9.
18. Hadjur, S., Williams, L. M., Ryan, N. K., Cobb, B. S., Sexton, T., Fraser, P., Fisher, A. G. & Merkenschlager, M. (2009). Cohesins form chromosomal cis-interactions at the developmentally regulated IFNG locus. *Nature* **460**, 410-3.
19. Kagey, M. H., Newman, J. J., Bilodeau, S., Zhan, Y., Orlando, D. A., van Berkum, N. L., Ebmeier, C. C., Goossens, J., Rahl, P. B., Levine, S. S., Taatjes, D. J., Dekker, J. & Young, R. A. (2010). Mediator and cohesin connect gene expression and chromatin architecture. *Nature* **467**, 430-5.
20. de Wit, E., Vos, E. S., Holwerda, S. J., Valdes-Quezada, C., Versteegen, M. J., Teunissen, H., Splinter, E., Wijchers, P. J., Krijger, P. H. & de Laat, W. (2015). CTCF Binding Polarity Determines Chromatin Looping. *Mol Cell* **60**, 676-84.
21. Guo, Y., Xu, Q., Canzio, D., Shou, J., Li, J., Gorkin, D. U., Jung, I., Wu, H., Zhai, Y., Tang, Y., Lu, Y., Wu, Y., Jia, Z., Li, W., Zhang, M. Q., Ren, B., Krainer, A. R., Maniatis, T. & Wu, Q. (2015). CRISPR Inversion of CTCF Sites Alters Genome Topology and Enhancer/Promoter Function. *Cell* **162**, 900-10.
22. Sanborn, A. L., Rao, S. S., Huang, S. C., Durand, N. C., Huntley, M. H., Jewett, A. I., Bochkov, I. D., Chinnappan, D., Cutkosky, A., Li, J., Geeting, K. P., Gnirke, A., Melnikov, A., McKenna, D., Stamenova, E. K., Lander, E. S. & Aiden, E. L. (2015). Chromatin extrusion explains key features of loop and domain formation in wild-type and engineered genomes. *Proc Natl Acad Sci U S A* **112**, E6456-65.
23. Fudenberg, G., Imakaev, M., Lu, C., Goloborodko, A., Abdennur, N. & Mirny, L. A. (2016). Formation of Chromosomal Domains by Loop Extrusion. *Cell Rep* **15**, 2038-49.
24. Rao, S., Huang, S.-C., Glenn St. Hilaire, B., Engreitz, J. M., Perez, E. M., Kieffer-Kwon, K.-R., Sanborn, A. L., Johnstone, S. E., Bochkov, I. D., Huang, X., Shamim, M. S., Omer, A. D., Bernstein, B. E., Casellas, R., Lander, E. S. & Lieberman Aiden, E. (2017). Cohesin Loss Eliminates All Loop Domains, Leading To Links Among Superenhancers And Downregulation Of Nearby Genes. *bioRxiv*.
25. Schwarzer, W., Abdennur, N., Goloborodko, A., Pekowska, A., Fudenberg, G., Loe-Mie, Y., Fonseca, N. A., Huber, W., Haering, C., Mirny, L. & Spitz, F. (2017). Two independent modes of chromatin organization revealed by cohesin removal. *Nature advance online publication*.
26. Wutz, G., Varnai, C., Nagasaka, K., Cisneros, D. A., Stocsits, R. R., Tang, W., Schoenfelder, S., Jessberger, G., Muhar, M., Hossain, M. J., Walther, N., Koch, B., Kueblbeck, M., Ellenberg, J., Zuber, J., Fraser, P. & Peters, J. M. (2017). Topologically associating domains and chromatin loops depend on cohesin and are regulated by CTCF, WAPL, and PDS5 proteins. *EMBO J* **36**, 3573-3599.
27. Vian, L., Pekowska, A., Rao, S. S. P., Kieffer-Kwon, K. R., Jung, S., Baranello, L., Huang, S. C., El Khattabi, L., Dose, M., Pruett, N., Sanborn, A. L., Canela, A., Maman, Y., Oksanen, A., Resch, W., Li, X., Lee, B., Kovalchuk, A. L., Tang, Z., Nelson, S., Di Pierro, M., Cheng, R. R., Machol, I., St Hilaire, B. G., Durand, N. C., Shamim, M. S., Stamenova, E. K., Onuchic, J. N., Ruan, Y., Nussenzweig, A., Levens, D., Aiden, E. L. & Casellas, R. (2018). The Energetics and Physiological Impact of Cohesin Extrusion. *Cell* **175**, 292-294.


28. Haarhuis, J. H. I., van der Weide, R. H., Blomen, V. A., Yanez-Cuna, J. O., Amendola, M., van Ruiten, M. S., Krijger, P. H. L., Teunissen, H., Medema, R. H., van Steensel, B., Brummelkamp, T. R., de Wit, E. & Rowland, B. D. (2017). The Cohesin Release Factor WAPL Restricts Chromatin Loop Extension. *Cell* **169**, 693-707 e14.
29. Ganji, M., Shaltiel, I. A., Bisht, S., Kim, E., Kalichava, A., Haering, C. H. & Dekker, C. (2018). Real-time imaging of DNA loop extrusion by condensin. *Science* **360**, 102-105.
30. Buckle, A., Brackley, C. A., Boyle, S., Marenduzzo, D. & Gilbert, N. (2018). Polymer Simulations of Heteromorphic Chromatin Predict the 3D Folding of Complex Genomic Loci. *Mol Cell* **72**, 786-797 e11.
31. Nuebler, J., Fudenberg, G., Imakaev, M., Abdennur, N. & Mirny, L. A. (2018). Chromatin organization by an interplay of loop extrusion and compartmental segregation. *Proc Natl Acad Sci U S A* **115**, E6697-E6706.
32. Bianco, S., Lupianez, D. G., Chiariello, A. M., Annunziatella, C., Kraft, K., Schopflin, R., Wittler, L., Andrey, G., Vingron, M., Pombo, A., Mundlos, S. & Nicodemi, M. (2018). Polymer physics predicts the effects of structural variants on chromatin architecture. *Nat Genet* **50**, 662-667.
33. Giorgetti, L., Galupa, R., Nora, E. P., Piolot, T., Lam, F., Dekker, J., Tiana, G. & Heard, E. (2014). Predictive polymer modeling reveals coupled fluctuations in chromosome conformation and transcription. *Cell* **157**, 950-63.
34. Nora, E. P., Goloborodko, A., Valton, A. L., Gibcus, J. H., Uebersohn, A., Abdennur, N., Dekker, J., Mirny, L. A. & Bruneau, B. G. (2017). Targeted Degradation of CTCF Decouples Local Insulation of Chromosome Domains from Genomic Compartmentalization. *Cell* **169**, 930-944 e22.
35. Lavelle, C. (2014). Pack, unpack, bend, twist, pull, push: the physical side of gene expression. *Curr Opin Genet Dev* **25**, 74-84.
36. Busslinger, G. A., Stocsits, R. R., van der Lelij, P., Axelsson, E., Tedeschi, A., Galjart, N. & Peters, J. M. (2017). Cohesin is positioned in mammalian genomes by transcription, CTCF and Wapl. *Nature* **544**, 503-507.
37. Noordermeer, D., Leleu, M., Schorderet, P., Joye, E., Chabaud, F. & Duboule, D. (2014). Temporal dynamics and developmental memory of 3D chromatin architecture at Hox gene loci. *Elife* **3**, e02557.
38. Noordermeer, D., Leleu, M., Splinter, E., Rougemont, J., De Laat, W. & Duboule, D. (2011). The dynamic architecture of Hox gene clusters. *Science* **334**, 222-5.
39. Du, Z., Zheng, H., Huang, B., Ma, R., Wu, J., Zhang, X., He, J., Xiang, Y., Wang, Q., Li, Y., Ma, J., Zhang, X., Zhang, K., Wang, Y., Zhang, M. Q., Gao, J., Dixon, J. R., Wang, X., Zeng, J. & Xie, W. (2017). Allelic reprogramming of 3D chromatin architecture during early mammalian development. *Nature* **547**, 232-235.
40. Hug, C. B., Grimaldi, A. G., Kruse, K. & Vaquerizas, J. M. (2017). Chromatin Architecture Emerges during Zygotic Genome Activation Independent of Transcription. *Cell* **169**, 216-228 e19.
41. Ke, Y., Xu, Y., Chen, X., Feng, S., Liu, Z., Sun, Y., Yao, X., Li, F., Zhu, W., Gao, L., Chen, H., Du, Z., Xie, W., Xu, X., Huang, X. & Liu, J. (2017). 3D Chromatin Structures of Mature Gametes and Structural Reprogramming during Mammalian Embryogenesis. *Cell* **170**, 367-381 e20.
42. Lieberman-Aiden, E., van Berkum, N. L., Williams, L., Imakaev, M., Ragoczy, T., Telling, A., Amit, I., Lajoie, B. R., Sabo, P. J., Dorschner, M. O., Sandstrom, R., Bernstein, B., Bender, M. A., Groudine, M., Gnirke, A., Stamatoyannopoulos, J., Mirny, L. A., Lander, E. S. & Dekker, J. (2009). Comprehensive mapping of long-range interactions reveals folding principles of the human genome. *Science* **326**, 289-93.
43. Yaffe, E. & Tanay, A. (2011). Probabilistic modeling of Hi-C contact maps eliminates systematic biases to characterize global chromosomal architecture. *Nat Genet* **43**, 1059-65.
44. Fraser, J., Ferrai, C., Chiariello, A. M., Schueler, M., Rito, T., Laudanno, G., Barbieri, M., Moore, B. L., Kraemer, D. C., Aitken, S., Xie, S. Q., Morris, K. J., Itoh, M., Kawaji, H., Jaeger, I.,

- Hayashizaki, Y., Carninci, P., Forrest, A. R., Consortium, F., Semple, C. A., Dostie, J., Pombo, A. & Nicodemi, M. (2015). Hierarchical folding and reorganization of chromosomes are linked to transcriptional changes in cellular differentiation. *Mol Syst Biol* **11**, 852.
45. Rowley, M. J., Nichols, M. H., Lyu, X., Ando-Kuri, M., Rivera, I. S. M., Hermetz, K., Wang, P., Ruan, Y. & Corces, V. G. (2017). Evolutionarily Conserved Principles Predict 3D Chromatin Organization. *Mol Cell* **67**, 837-852 e7.
46. Hsieh, T.-H. S., Slobodyanyuk, E., Hansen, A. S., Cattoglio, C., Rando, O. J., Tjian, R. & Darzacq, X. (2019). Resolving the 3D landscape of transcription-linked mammalian chromatin folding. *bioRxiv*, 638775.
47. Kang, J., Xu, B., Yao, Y., Lin, W., Hennessy, C., Fraser, P. & Feng, J. (2011). A dynamical model reveals gene co-localizations in nucleus. *PLoS Comput Biol* **7**, e1002094.
48. Lu, H., Yu, D., Hansen, A. S., Ganguly, S., Liu, R., Heckert, A., Darzacq, X. & Zhou, Q. (2018). Phase-separation mechanism for C-terminal hyperphosphorylation of RNA polymerase II. *Nature* **558**, 318-323.
49. Flyamer, I. M., Gassler, J., Imakaev, M., Brandao, H. B., Ulianov, S. V., Abdennur, N., Razin, S. V., Mirny, L. A. & Tachibana-Konwalski, K. (2017). Single-nucleus Hi-C reveals unique chromatin reorganization at oocyte-to-zygote transition. *Nature* **544**, 110-114.
50. Nagano, T., Lubling, Y., Varnai, C., Dudley, C., Leung, W., Baran, Y., Mendelson Cohen, N., Wingett, S., Fraser, P. & Tanay, A. (2017). Cell-cycle dynamics of chromosomal organization at single-cell resolution. *Nature* **547**, 61-67.
51. Stevens, T. J., Lando, D., Basu, S., Atkinson, L. P., Cao, Y., Lee, S. F., Leeb, M., Wohlfahrt, K. J., Boucher, W., O'Shaughnessy-Kirwan, A., Cramard, J., Faure, A. J., Ralser, M., Blanco, E., Morey, L., Sanso, M., Palayret, M. G. S., Lehner, B., Di Croce, L., Wutz, A., Hendrich, B., Klenerman, D. & Laue, E. D. (2017). 3D structures of individual mammalian genomes studied by single-cell Hi-C. *Nature* **544**, 59-64.
52. Bintu, B., Mateo, L. J., Su, J. H., Sinnott-Armstrong, N. A., Parker, M., Kinrot, S., Yamaya, K., Boettiger, A. N. & Zhuang, X. (2018). Super-resolution chromatin tracing reveals domains and cooperative interactions in single cells. *Science* **362**.
53. Szabo, Q., Jost, D., Chang, J. M., Cattoni, D. I., Papadopoulos, G. L., Bonev, B., Sexton, T., Gurgo, J., Jacquier, C., Nollmann, M., Bantignies, F. & Cavalli, G. (2018). TADs are 3D structural units of higher-order chromosome organization in Drosophila. *Sci Adv* **4**, eaar8082.
54. Wang, S., Su, J. H., Beliveau, B. J., Bintu, B., Moffitt, J. R., Wu, C. T. & Zhuang, X. (2016). Spatial organization of chromatin domains and compartments in single chromosomes. *Science* **353**, 598-602.
55. Cattoni, D. I., Cardozo Gizzi, A. M., Georgieva, M., Di Stefano, M., Valeri, A., Chamousset, D., Houbron, C., Dejardin, S., Fiche, J. B., Gonzalez, I., Chang, J. M., Sexton, T., Marti-Renom, M. A., Bantignies, F., Cavalli, G. & Nollmann, M. (2017). Single-cell absolute contact probability detection reveals chromosomes are organized by multiple low-frequency yet specific interactions. *Nat Commun* **8**, 1753.
56. Finn, E. H., Pegoraro, G., Brandao, H. B., Valton, A. L., Oomen, M. E., Dekker, J., Mirny, L. & Misteli, T. (2019). Extensive Heterogeneity and Intrinsic Variation in Spatial Genome Organization. *Cell* **176**, 1502-1515 e10.
57. Cardozo Gizzi, A. M., Cattoni, D. I., Fiche, J. B., Espinola, S. M., Gurgo, J., Messina, O., Houbron, C., Ogiyama, Y., Papadopoulos, G. L., Cavalli, G., Lagha, M. & Nollmann, M. (2019). Microscopy-Based Chromosome Conformation Capture Enables Simultaneous Visualization of Genome Organization and Transcription in Intact Organisms. *Mol Cell* **74**, 212-222 e5.
58. Mateo, L. J., Murphy, S. E., Hafner, A., Cinquini, I. S., Walker, C. A. & Boettiger, A. N. (2019). Visualizing DNA folding and RNA in embryos at single-cell resolution. *Nature* **568**, 49-54.
59. Symmons, O., Uslu, V. V., Tsujimura, T., Ruf, S., Nassari, S., Schwarzer, W., Ettwiller, L. & Spitz, F. (2014). Functional and topological characteristics of mammalian regulatory domains. *Genome Res* **24**, 390-400.


60. Schoenfelder, S., Furlan-Magaril, M., Mifsud, B., Tavares-Cadete, F., Sugar, R., Javierre, B. M., Nagano, T., Katsman, Y., Sakthidevi, M., Wingett, S. W., Dimitrova, E., Dimond, A., Edelman, L. B., Elderkin, S., Tabbada, K., Darbo, E., Andrews, S., Herman, B., Higgs, A., LeProust, E., Osborne, C. S., Mitchell, J. A., Luscombe, N. M. & Fraser, P. (2015). The pluripotent regulatory circuitry connecting promoters to their long-range interacting elements. *Genome Res* **25**, 582-97.
61. Symmons, O., Pan, L., Remeseiro, S., Aktas, T., Klein, F., Huber, W. & Spitz, F. (2016). The Shh Topological Domain Facilitates the Action of Remote Enhancers by Reducing the Effects of Genomic Distances. *Dev Cell* **39**, 529-543.
62. Lupianez, D. G., Kraft, K., Heinrich, V., Krawitz, P., Brancati, F., Klopocki, E., Horn, D., Kayserili, H., Opitz, J. M., Laxova, R., Santos-Simarro, F., Gilbert-Dussardier, B., Wittler, L., Borschiwer, M., Haas, S. A., Osterwalder, M., Franke, M., Timmermann, B., Hecht, J., Spielmann, M., Visel, A. & Mundlos, S. (2015). Disruptions of topological chromatin domains cause pathogenic rewiring of gene-enhancer interactions. *Cell* **161**, 1012-1025.
63. Weischenfeldt, J., Dubash, T., Drainas, A. P., Mardin, B. R., Chen, Y., Stutz, A. M., Waszak, S. M., Bosco, G., Halvorsen, A. R., Raeder, B., Efthymiopoulos, T., Erkek, S., Siegl, C., Brenner, H., Brustugun, O. T., Dieter, S. M., Northcott, P. A., Petersen, I., Pfister, S. M., Schneider, M., Solberg, S. K., Thunissen, E., Weichert, W., Zichner, T., Thomas, R., Peifer, M., Helland, A., Ball, C. R., Jechlinger, M., Sotillo, R., Glimm, H. & Korbel, J. O. (2017). Pan-cancer analysis of somatic copy-number alterations implicates IRS4 and IGF2 in enhancer hijacking. *Nat Genet* **49**, 65-74.
64. Despang, A., Schopflin, R., Franke, M., Ali, S., Jerkovic, I., Paliou, C., Chan, W. L., Timmermann, B., Wittler, L., Vingron, M., Mundlos, S. & Ibrahim, D. M. (2019). Functional dissection of the Sox9-Kcnj2 locus identifies nonessential and instructive roles of TAD architecture. *Nat Genet* **51**, 1263-1271.
65. Rodriguez-Carballo, E., Lopez-Delisle, L., Zhan, Y., Fabre, P. J., Beccari, L., El-Idrissi, I., Huynh, T. H. N., Ozadam, H., Dekker, J. & Duboule, D. (2017). The HoxD cluster is a dynamic and resilient TAD boundary controlling the segregation of antagonistic regulatory landscapes. *Genes Dev* **31**, 2264-2281.
66. Franke, M., Ibrahim, D. M., Andrey, G., Schwarzer, W., Heinrich, V., Schopflin, R., Kraft, K., Kempfer, R., Jerkovic, I., Chan, W. L., Spielmann, M., Timmermann, B., Wittler, L., Kurth, I., Cambiaso, P., Zuffardi, O., Houge, G., Lambie, L., Brancati, F., Pombo, A., Vingron, M., Spitz, F. & Mundlos, S. (2016). Formation of new chromatin domains determines pathogenicity of genomic duplications. *Nature* **538**, 265-269.
67. van Bemmelen, J. G., Galupa, R., Gard, C., Servant, N., Picard, C., Davies, J., Szempruch, A. J., Zhan, Y., Zyllicz, J. J., Nora, E. P., Lameiras, S., de Wit, E., Gientgen, D., Baulande, S., Giorgetti, L., Guttman, M., Hughes, J. R., Higgs, D. R., Gribnau, J. & Heard, E. (2019). The bipartite TAD organization of the X-inactivation center ensures opposing developmental regulation of Tsix and Xist. *Nat Genet* **51**, 1024-1034.
68. Narendra, V., Bulajic, M., Dekker, J., Mazzoni, E. O. & Reinberg, D. (2016). CTCF-mediated topological boundaries during development foster appropriate gene regulation. *Genes Dev* **30**, 2657-2662.
69. Narendra, V., Rocha, P. P., An, D., Raviram, R., Skok, J. A., Mazzoni, E. O. & Reinberg, D. (2015). CTCF establishes discrete functional chromatin domains at the Hox clusters during differentiation. *Science* **347**, 1017-21.
70. Forcato, M., Nicoletti, C., Pal, K., Livi, C. M., Ferrari, F. & Bicciato, S. (2017). Comparison of computational methods for Hi-C data analysis. *Nat Methods* **14**, 679-685.
71. Phillips-Cremins, J. E., Sauria, M. E., Sanyal, A., Gerasimova, T. I., Lajoie, B. R., Bell, J. S., Ong, C. T., Hookway, T. A., Guo, C., Sun, Y., Bland, M. J., Wagstaff, W., Dalton, S., McDevitt, T. C., Sen, R., Dekker, J., Taylor, J. & Corces, V. G. (2013). Architectural protein subclasses shape 3D organization of genomes during lineage commitment. *Cell* **153**, 1281-95.


72. Giorgetti, L., Lajoie, B. R., Carter, A. C., Attia, M., Zhan, Y., Xu, J., Chen, C. J., Kaplan, N., Chang, H. Y., Heard, E. & Dekker, J. (2016). Structural organization of the inactive X chromosome in the mouse. *Nature* **535**, 575-9.
73. Zhan, Y., Mariani, L., Barozzi, I., Schulz, E. G., Bluthgen, N., Stadler, M., Tiana, G. & Giorgetti, L. (2017). Reciprocal insulation analysis of Hi-C data shows that TADs represent a functionally but not structurally privileged scale in the hierarchical folding of chromosomes. *Genome Res* **27**, 479-490.
74. Deng, W., Lee, J., Wang, H., Miller, J., Reik, A., Gregory, P. D., Dean, A. & Blobel, G. A. (2012). Controlling long-range genomic interactions at a native locus by targeted tethering of a looping factor. *Cell* **149**, 1233-44.
75. Kerpedjiev, P., Abdennur, N., Lekschas, F., McCallum, C., Dinkla, K., Strobelt, H., Luber, J. M., Ouellette, S. B., Azhir, A., Kumar, N., Hwang, J., Lee, S., Alver, B. H., Pfister, H., Mirny, L. A., Park, P. J. & Gehlenborg, N. (2018). HiGlass: web-based visual exploration and analysis of genome interaction maps. *Genome Biol* **19**, 125.
76. Ben Zouari, Y., Molitor, A. M., Sikorska, N., Pancaldi, V. & Sexton, T. (2019). ChiCMaxima: a robust and simple pipeline for detection and visualization of chromatin looping in Capture Hi-C. *Genome Biol* **20**, 102.
77. Babbs, C., Furniss, D., Morriss-Kay, G. M. & Wilkie, A. O. (2008). Polydactyly in the mouse mutant Doublefoot involves altered Gli3 processing and is caused by a large deletion in cis to Indian hedgehog. *Mech Dev* **125**, 517-26.
78. Davis, C. A., Hitz, B. C., Sloan, C. A., Chan, E. T., Davidson, J. M., Gabdank, I., Hilton, J. A., Jain, K., Baymuradov, U. K., Narayanan, A. K., Onate, K. C., Graham, K., Miyasato, S. R., Dreszer, T. R., Strattan, J. S., Jolanki, O., Tanaka, F. Y. & Cherry, J. M. (2018). The Encyclopedia of DNA elements (ENCODE): data portal update. *Nucleic Acids Res* **46**, D794-D801.
79. Ambrosini, G. PWMTools.



a






b





		Nipbl	cohesin	CTCF	WAPL
Compartments		↑	↑	no change	↓
TADs		↓	↓	↓	↑





**BUT:**

- CTCF not at all TAD borders; not all CTCF sites make a border
- Inverted CTCF sites do not necessarily make new loops
- Context-specific effects of TAD deletion on phenotype
- TAD disruption has mild transcriptomic effects

TAD made by cohesin loop extrusion